63

51

# THE OBJECTIONS OF THE PRESBYTERY of DUMBARTON, AGAINST Mr ADDIE's Diſcourſe on James i. 27. EXPLAINED AND DEFENDED. WITH An Authentic COPY of that DISCOURSE: AND A View of the Scripture Doctrine of EXPIATORY SACRIFICES, in Oppoſition to the Doctrine of Mr ADDIE's Diſcourſe; and of a long Speech delivered at the Meeting of the Synod at Irvine, October 1770, ſo far as it was intelligible.

BY

ARCHIBALD SMITH, V.D.M.

K

GLASGOW:
Printed by A. DUNCAN and COMPANY,
and Sold by JAMES DUNCAN, oppoſite the Main-Guard, Trongate,
MDCCLXXI.

[ Price Sixpence. ]

# TO THE PUBLIC.

The ſubject of the following publication hath ma a great noiſe in this part of the country.

If the diſcourſe merits but half the encomiums berally beſtowed upon it by Mr ADDIE's profeſſ friends, this publication muſt be conſidered as an act juſtice to ſociety, and honourable to the candidate.

If the preſbytery's objections are well founded, it but fair, that uſeful characters, violently attacke ſhould be vindicated in the eye of the world.

## JAMES i. 27.

*Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father, is this, to viſit the fatherleſs and widows in their affliction, and to keep himſelf unſpotted from the world.*

IT is the great aim of the author of this epiſtle, to repreſent religion as of an active nature; which muſt not only be ſeated in the heart, but muſt diſcover itſelf in the life and conduct. Some ſatisfied themſelves with a profeſſion of religion, while no inconveniency attended it: but were ready to yield, whenever any ſtrong temptation preſented itſelf to allure them from their duty: and to be ſtaggered whenever any hardſhip attended a patient perſeverance in rectitude. To him whoſe mind is in ſuch a wavering ſituation, James, the ſervant of God, and of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, thus addreſſeth himſelf: "Let not that man think he ſhall receive any "thing of the Lord." The duty of perſeverance he enforces upon them, from the conſideration of the tranſitory nature of all things here below.

"The ſun, ſays he, is no ſooner riſen with a burn-"ing heat, but it withereth the graſs, and the flower "thereof falleth, and the grace of the faſhion of it pe-"riſheth. So alſo ſhall the rich man fade away in his "ways."

On the other hand, the reward of perſeverance is ſecure and laſting. "Bleſſed is the man that endureth "temptation; for, when he is tried, he ſhall receive "the crown of life, which the Lord hath promiſed to "them that love him." He proceeds to correct ſome miſtakes that had crept in among them, with reſpect to the nature of temptation: and, after that, returns to the great view he had before him; which was, to re-

preſent religion as of an active nature, and not conſiſting in profeſſion and external obſervance.

" Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, " deceiving your own ſelves: he who is not a forget- " ful hearer, but a doer of the word, this man ſhall be " bleſſed in his deed." They, on the other hand, who believe themſelves to be devout, becauſe they hear the goſpel, and talk much about it, are groſsly miſtaken: for the Apoſtle adds, in the words immediately preceding the words of our exerciſe: " If any man among " you, ſeem to be religious, and bridleth not his " tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's re- " ligion is vain." Still in the ſame view of repreſenting religion as of an active nature, the Apoſtle goes on in the verſe, which is the ſubject of our exerciſe, to give a deſcription of religion from the effects it naturally produces. This is the only way we can diſcern good and evil, and is the method pointed out by our Saviour himſelf: " A good tree (ſays he, Matth. vii. 18.) can- " not bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree " bring forth good fruit; wherefore by their fruit ye " ſhall know them." Pure religion, &c.

The original words are theſe: Θρησκεια καθαρα και αμιαντος παρα τω θεω και πατρι, αὕτη εστιν, επισκεπτεσθαι ορφανους και χηρας εν τη θλιψει αυτων, ασπιλον ἑαυτον τηρειν απο τοῦ κοσμου.

The force of theſe words is pretty well preſerved in our tranſlation. We may, however, obſerve, that επισκεπτεσθαι, is a more expreſſive term, than *to viſit*, by which it is rendered. It ſignifies, to take the *overſight* or *charge* of any thing: and was particularly applied to the office of Biſhops, overſeers in the church of Chriſt. The Apoſtle's meaning, therefore, is, that they ought to make every proviſion neceſſary for rendering the unfortunate happy. In order to aſcertain the true ſenſe of the paſſage, it may not be improper to take notice, that, as it was addreſſed to Jews, (the epiſtle being directed to the twelve tribes that are ſcattered abroad)

ſo the phraſeology common among the Jews is preſerved. And, in the whole account of true religion, there is a manifeſt alluſion to the Ceremonial law of the Iſraelites. Accordingly the two epithets, καθαρος and αμιαντος, *pure* and *undefiled*, are the very words uſed by the ſeventy Greek interpreters, to expreſs ceremonial as well as moral cleanneſs and purity.

A man who was purified according to the law, was καθαρος or αμιαντος. He who was defiled, ſo that he would not appear to offer ſacrifice to God, was ακαθαρος or μιαντος. The ſame terms were applied to a variety of other objects; and, particularly, to the veſſels that were holy or unholy.

As the principal thing in religion that the Jews regarded, was the diſtinction of clean and unclean: and as they ſtrongly imagined, that their purifications were acceptable to God, it is with particular addreſs, that the Apoſtle adopts their own form of expreſſion, when giving a very different account of religion, from that which was generally received among them; for they would ſtill ſtrongly feel their force, though applied to a very different thing from cups and veſſels of various kinds.

There is another quality of true religion added in the text.—"It is pure and undefiled before God and the Father: it is acceptable to the ſupreme Being, and receives his approbation.—The words, *God and the Father*," are a Syriac form of expreſſion, and ſeem to expreſs only this, God our Father.—If any think they reſpect the diſtinction of Father and Son, it makes no odds; only we need not have recourſe to ſuch an expreſſion, for proof of this doctrine. The words are uſed in the ſame way, in ſeveral other paſſages of ſcripture, ſeparated by the conjunctive particle. Thus, 2 Cor. xi. 31. the ſupreme Being is ſtyled the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

The ſame title is given to him in Eph. i. 3. Col. i. 3.

and in Phil. iv. 20. we have a doxology in theſe words, "Now, unto God, and our Father, be glory for ever "and ever. Amen."

In the words of our text, the two appellations, *God and Father*, are, on this occaſion, diſtinguiſhed with great propriety. The term *God*, Θεος, conveys to us an idea of power and holineſs, united with ſome other of the divine perfections. It does not, however, ſo much expreſs kindneſs and affection, as rule and dominion. The name of a father adds whatever is tender and endearing. We ſtand in the relation of children to God, and enjoy the effects of his paternal love and care. Of conſequence, we are all brethren together, and are bound, by the ſtrongeſt ties, tc perform reciprocal acts of kindneſs to one another, in imitation of our heavenly parent. The appellation of Father, therefore, is the moſt proper that can be given to the divine Nature, before an exhortation to mercy and compaſſion. If God has pitied us as a father pities his children, we ought ſurely to have compaſſion upon one another.

The two duties which are mentioned as the genuine effects of *pure and undefiled religion*, are expreſſed in language that needs little illuſtration. Mercy and compaſſion, in general, are recommended to us ſtrongly, in the firſt of them. Though only one ſtriking occaſion for their exertion, is ſingled out. The widow and the orphan are uſually the perſons that ſtand moſt in need of aſſiſtance; they are left defenceleſs in the world; the perſons who would have afforded them ſupport and protection, and ſupplied them with whatever is neceſſary, comfortable, and joyous, in life, are removed. They may be left in wealthy enough external circumſtances, yet ſtill they need ſome friend to direct them; and ſtill their loſs demands ſome ſympathiſing breaſt to comfort them.

The other effect of religon, that it ought to make men live unſpotted from the world, comprehends un-

der it all manner of holineſs and purity of life and converſation. This form of expreſſion likewiſe alludes to the cuſtom of the Jews. Ceremonial cleanneſs was looked upon as of the greateſt importance among them. In purifications conſiſted a great part of their religion. According to them, therefore, undefiled religion was, to keep themſelves unſpotted by theſe things which occaſioned ritual defilement. But the Apoſtle inſiſts on a purity of a very different nature; to keep themſelves unſpotted from the world.

By the world, he no doubt means theſe paſſions which predominate in the minds of worldly men; reſentment, ambition, ſenſual deſire, and covetouſneſs.

We ſhall now expreſs the words of our exerciſe, as we have explained them, in the following paraphraſe.

Pure and undefiled religion, does not conſiſt in ceremonial purifications, and ritual obſervances. On the contrary, that religion, which is agreeable to that holy God, who is the Father of mercies, diſcovers itſelf in a reſemblance to him, the moſt pure and beneficent of all beings. It diſcovers itſelf, in relieving the diſtreſſed, comforting the afflicted, and inſtructing the ignorant; and in renouncing the authority, and ſubduing the power, of every iraſcible, ſenſual, and worldly paſſion.

The doctrine which ariſes from theſe words is this, IT IS THE INTENTION OF ALL TRUE RELIGON, TO RECOMMEND MERCY AND HOLINESS.

This doctrine may be proven from both the nature of religion in general, and the tendency of theſe manifeſtations which God has made in favour of the degenerate children of men.

Both theſe truths we ſhall endeavour to illuſtrate in as few words as poſſible. *Firſt*, then, From the nature of religion, it muſt be its intention to *recommend mercy and holineſs*. The great object religion preſents to us, is the divine Nature. It is from him we derived our exiſtence; by his providence we have been ſupported;

from his bounty we expect whatever happineſs yet awaits us; all our truſt and dependance are upon his goodneſs. We hope for rewards in a future ſtate under his government: and we know that theſe will not be beſtowed indiſcriminately; but will be beſtowed on thoſe who are poſſeſſed of that heart and temper which is acceptable to God: We may reſt aſſured that God will beſtow the good things of the future world on theſe minds which bear the greateſt reſemblance to himſelf. All the inhabitants of heaven, from the higheſt ſeraph to the loweſt ſaint, will in their ſphere be like unto God. Now, all true religion, both natural and revealed, repreſents him to us, as a Being of the moſt perfect purity and goodneſs: He is the holy One who inhabits eternity: He is the Lord God merciful and gracious, who pardons iniquity, tranſgreſſion, and ſin. Thus he is repreſented by revelation, and reaſon correſponds with theſe notions; for it is impoſſible that he who is poſſeſſed of infinite power, ſhould not be good and holy: It is the weakneſs of earthly potentates, that renders them ſuſpicious, cruel, and revengeful: Every commotion among their ſubjects makes their thrones to ſhake: The ſword is drawn to ſecure their authority, and devaſtation and murder are the conſequences. But the throne of God is eſtabliſhed in the heavens, beyond the reach of violence: he has no occaſion to be cruel; and we may reſt aſſured, that no being takes pleaſure in deſtruction, except it be to promote ſome end of his own. In the ſame manner, it appears from reaſon, that he muſt be holy and pure: No addition can be made to his happineſs; the attainments of wealth, pleaſure, fame, and power, can never be the views from which he acts; every thing deſireable is already poſſeſſed by him.

Mercy and holineſs, then, which ſo peculiarly belong to God, the great object of religion, muſt of conſequence be the qualities which true religion intends to

recommend, and which God requires in his accountable and religious creatures: and this is the doctrine of the text. He will take pleaſure in thoſe who are of a pure heart, who are untainted with the maxims and purſuits of a degenerate world, and raiſe them to the contemplation of himſelf, the great pattern of holineſs, and to the enjoyment of endleſs happineſs at his right-hand. They who have become perfect, as their Father in heaven is perfect; who have done good, as he does, who makes his ſun to riſe, and rain to fall, even upon the unthankful and the evil, ſhall ſhine forth as the ſun in the kingdom of their almighty Father.

We may view this ſubject in another light. A regard to God is a great, a leading, principle of all religion: If he be a God of love and mercy, who has conferred great favours upon ourſelves, as all true religion diſcovers him to be, then our affection towards him muſt conſiſt of love, and gratitude, and veneration. Now, we naturally imitate that being whom we love and admire; we gradually adopt his views and manner, and begin to think and act as he does. In this manner every great and amiable character forms inferior minds into a reſemblance of itſelf. The true love of God, then, the great principle of the religious life, muſt make us like unto God.

'But he is good to all, and his tender mercies are 'over all his works. He is of purer eyes than to be-'hold evil, and he cannot look on iniquity.' He then, who loves him muſt be kind, compaſſionate, forgiving, and diſpoſed to do good; and his heart muſt utterly abhor all manner of ſin and moral defilement. This again is the doctrine of the text.

But, *Secondly*, It is the tendency of all theſe manifeſtations which God has made in favour of the degenerate children of men to recommend mercy and holineſs.

The firſt written revelation God gave to men, was

that to the Iſraelites by means of Moſes. The great number of ſacrifices, and other obſervances, under that diſpenſation, is the firſt thing that ſtrikes the attention: Now, one great intention of many of theſe ſacrifices, at leaſt, was evidently to promote a ſpirit of mercy: He who offered them was injoined to invite the ſtranger, the fatherleſs, the widow, and the Levite, who had no inheritance with his brethren, to all his feaſts upon free-will offerings, Deut. xii. 17. And that he might have no temptation to apply his ſacrifice for other purpoſes, he is commanded to eat it on the ſame day upon which it was offered, Lev. vii. 15. The offering of the firſt fruits was another proviſion made for the indigent: on that occaſion they were to rejoice with the ſtranger and the Levite: the precepts regarding them we have in Deut. xxvi. The tithes of their ground was applied to the ſame purpoſe; and every man was obliged to give a ſolemn proteſtation, before God, that he had applied them properly. We have the forms of tithing, and of the proteſtation, xiv. and xxvi. chap. of Deuteronomy.

At the feaſt of Tabernacles, which happened every year after harveſt, they were commanded to rejoice for ſeveral days together, with their families, and the orphans, widows, and ſtrangers among them, Deut. xvi. 9.

The ſame was the ſpirit of the Jewiſh inſtitution, in many other reſpects. The field was not to be gleaned by the owner during the harveſt: The olive tree was to be beat only once, and not gone over again, Deut. xxii. 19. The pledge, if it was raiment, or any neceſſary utenſil, was not to be retained after the ſun went down, Exod. xxii. 26. They were obliged, if they would avoid the wrath of God, to lend money without intereſt, Deut. xv. 7. On every ſeventh year, the ground was left uncultivated, and its ſpontaneous increaſe, not inconſiderable, in better climes, was the property of

the poor, Exod. xxii. 11. On this year too, all perſonal rights preſcribed; every debt was cancelled; every Hebrew ſervant went away free from his maſter, liberally provided for out of the flock, threſhing-floor, and wine-preſs, Deut. xv. The great jubilee returned every 49th year, and reſtored every thing to the ſame ſituation it was in before that period. Not only were debts remitted, and ſlaves ſet free, but every eſtate returned to its antient proprietor.

In this manner did God, by means of Moſes, inculcate the glow of affection in ritual obſervances, and political inſtitutions. The rites themſelves were of ſmall value; it was the mercy, and charity with which they were accompanied, that were acceptable to God.

Thus, then, the firſt part of the doctrine is evident, from the tendency of theſe ceremonies; and it is hardly neceſſary to obſerve, how the other, holineſs, was recommended under that diſpenſation. It is the very ſpirit of the inſtitution to inforce purity and uprightneſs; even the denominations of the people have this tendency.

They were denominated a holy people, ſeparated and ſet apart from all nations on the face of the earth: They were a ſanctified nation, and a kingdom of prieſts: Every thing in their law was in oppoſition to moral defilement: And all their expiatory ſacrifices, however they came to miſtake them, were intended *chiefly* to remove this pollution, and convince them of its hainous and odious nature.

The ſame views are proſecuted by the prophets, theſe emancipated ſpirits, who made ſo vigorous a ſtand againſt the corrupt doctrine and worſhip of their times. The ſpirit of Moſes, the declarations of the prophets, and the precepts of the author of the epiſtle to the Hebrews, are the ſame; "To do good, and "to communicate, forget not; for with ſuch ſacrifices, "God is well pleaſed.

Iſaiah, i. 17. inſiſts ſtrongly on the vanity of ſacrifices, oblations, ſabbaths, and appointed feaſts, in thoſe men whoſe hands were full of blood and cruelty; but exhorts them to that frame of mind which ſtamps theſe performances with value, to ſeek judgement, relieve the oppreſſed, and plead for the widow. To the ſame purpoſe is his 57th chapter, from verſe 5th. In the days of Amos, they afflicted the juſt, took bribes, oppreſſed the poor, and turned them aſide in the gates, where, in theſe days, ſtood the judgment-ſeats; therefore, ſays the Prophet, chap. v. 2. "God hated and de-
" ſpiſed their feaſt days, and ſolemn aſſemblies; and re-
" fuſed to accept their burnt offerings, and meat offer-
" ings; and diſregarded the peace offerings of their
" fat beaſts.' In the book of Hoſea, chap. vi. 6. the Deity declares, " that he deſires mercy and not ſacri-
" fice.

This expreſſion our Saviour oftner than once applies to the Jews of his age, who, like their fathers, had neglected what was intended by the Moſaic rites.

In the New Teſtament, the ſame doctrine is purſued, and ſo ſtrongly inſiſted on, that mercy is often repreſented as the true characteriſtic of the pious and religigious. "Do good, ſays our Saviour, hoping for nothing;" Again, "and your reward ſhall be great, and ye ſhall be the children of the Higheſt; for he is kind to the unthankful and the evil." Put on, ſays the apoſtle Paul, " as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercy, kindneſs, long-ſuffering, forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, even as Chriſt forgave you, ſo alſo do ye." " Without holineſs," it is declared in another place, " That no man ſhall ſee the Lord."

The ſpirit of the goſpel muſt be the ſpirit of holineſs and mercy. We were the ſervants of ſin, and heirs of deſtruction: God was pleaſed to ſend his Son to die for us, and relieve us from this miſerable ſituation. What

manner of perſons then ought we to be? It is ſurely moſt inconſiſtent in us, to continue any longer the ſervants of ſin; we are called by every invitation to holineſs and integrity. It was the love and mercy of God which moved him to ſend our Redeemer into the world. We ought therefore to be merciful ourſelves. Ye were bond-men in the land of Egypt, ſays God to the Iſraelites, therefore befriend the ſtranger among you. The argument was unanſwerable. Ye were heirs of miſery, ſays God to us, therefore be kind to the miſerable. If God has forgiven us our hundred talents, becauſe we could not pay, it would be baſe in us to oppreſs our brother for an hundred pence.

Let us then cultivate this truly Chriſtian frame of mind. Let us renounce the world, with all its flattering temptations to iniquity, and keep ourſelves untainted by its vitious maxims. Thus ſhall we walk before the Lord for ever in white raiment. Let us draw out our ſouls to the hungry, and ſatisfy the afflicted ſoul; then ſhall our light riſe in obſcurity, and our darkneſs be as the noon-day, and the Lord ſhall guide us continually. Our light ſhall break forth as the morning, and our health ſhall ſpring forth ſpeedily; and our righteouſneſs ſhall go before us; and the glory of the Lord ſhall be our rereward.

# OBJECTIONS

BY THE

# PRESBYTERY of DUMBARTON,

Againſt an Exerciſe and Addition, on James i. 27. delivered by Mr JAMES ADDIE, on Trials in order to Ordination, on the third of July 1770, as they ſtand in the Minutes of Preſbytery of that Date.

IN order rightly to underſtand theſe Objections which follow, it is proper to let the public know, that, upon that ſame day, Mr Addie alſo delivered another diſcourſe upon trial, which was likewiſe objected againſt. The preſbytery, however, agreed to confine their Objections to the Exerciſe and Addition, having ſuffered the other to paſs as a piece of trial.

With reſpect to both diſcourſes, their minutes ſtand thus.

"The preſbytery taking the ſame into conſideration, ſeveral members declared their entire ſatisfaction with both diſcourſes. Other members declared they were of another opinion, and mentioned ſeveral objections, both againſt their *general ſtrain*, and that ſeveral very important things were omitted in them, where it ſeemed to the objectors abſolutely neceſſary to bring them in;" (confining the above, and what follows, to the Exerciſe and Addition, they proceed,) "and that, particularly, in the deſcription of the *great object of religion*, there was no regard ſhown to any thing but to God abſolutely conſidered, without relation to the glorious manifeſtation of himſelf in the goſpel covenant.

"And that in his deſcription of the manifeſtations of

God to man, in the after-part of the diſcourſe, when ſpeaking of ſacrifices, he totally neglects the inſtitution of them with reſpect to guilt, and the ultimate reference of them to a *Saviour*, and only mentions the influence of them with reſpect to pollution.

" And when he comes, afterwards, to ſpeak, *particularly*, of the manifeſtation of God in, or by Jeſus Chriſt, he does it only in ſuch general terms, as leaves great room to doubt, what his own ſentiments in reſpect to the peculiar doctrines of the Chriſtian diſpenſation are.

" To which important objections, it was added, that Mr Addie, in purſuing the above plan in more than one place, and, particularly towards the concluſion of his Exerciſe and Addition, ſeems to reſt our final acceptance with God upon that charitable frame of ſpirit, and life of holineſs, which he had been recommending; and thereby, to the apprehenſion of the objectors, publiſhing the merit of good works."

After reaſoning upon which objections, the preſbytery refuſed to ſuſtain the diſcourſe as part of trials, and ſiſted procedure.

Upon the caſe thus ſtated, we muſt beg leave to obſerve as follows.

1*ſt*, That the preſbytery were ſo far from ſtating their objections againſt the candidate's diſcourſes with rigid ſeverity, that they freely ſuſtained one of them, though ſome of the members declared, they were rather more diſguſted with the one ſuſtained, than with the other, and had their particular objections, againſt it, in readineſs to adduce.

2*d*, That however much they might be diſpoſed to gentle meaſures, the importance of the objections againſt the Exerciſe and Addition ſeemed to be ſo great, upon a thorough attention unto them, that, as juſt judges, and men of integrity and uprightneſs, and who are to give an account of their conduct to a greater

than man, they could not proceed otherwiſe than as they have done.

*3d*, That, though it may be objected againſt the conduct of the preſbytery, that their ſiſting procedure was unduly ſevere, yet, in a matter of ſuch conſequence, as ſeemed to them to affect the very *eſſence* of the religion of the goſpel, they thought themſelves, in duty, bound to ſtop for a little, till they ſhould have time to conſider what to do. And here let it alſo be obſerved, that they are very unjuſtly repreſented, when the high charge is brought againſt them, of ſiſting procedure *ſine die*. There is no ſuch deciſion paſſed by them. Every one underſtands the meaning of theſe words, when they are inſerted in the deciſion of a judicatory. The preſbytery ſimply ſiſted procedure, without any expreſſion of ſuch import. And their meaning was to be ready to proceed againſt next meeting.

'Tis true, in the minutes, the expreſſion is indefinite; but the confuſion ariſing from the oppoſition in the preſbytery was the occaſion of this: and the appeal being ſo quickly taken againſt the reſolution, without freely debating the ſubject, took it entirely out of the preſbytery's hands.——And, if the ſubſequent conduct of the preſbytery ſhould be very diſagreeable to Mr Addie and his friends, they have *themſelves* alone to blame for that. In their reaſons of appeal to the ſynod, and manner of debate at that bar, they have attacked the honour and integrity of the members in oppoſition to them. And Mr Addie, in particular, has, in his third reaſon of appeal, attacked the conſtitution of the church itſelf*. The preſbytery have therefore been drawn to the field in ſelf-defence: they have been led to the bar of their ſuperiors, to vindicate their own moral characters as individuals; to defend their rights as judges, and to procure redreſs from the ſupreme

* "That he is inclined to believe lay members have no right to "judge" of ſuch diſcourſes.

judicatory of this church, for the violence offered to its conſtitution by a ſentence of the ſynod at Irvine. And if, in the progreſs of this cauſe, any thing ſevere or poignant hath dropped from them, or may be thought to appear in what follows: candour and ingenuity will, at leaſt, make them this allowance,——that the expreſſion of a juſt indignation, is what is but reaſonably to be expected from men of liberal, and honeſt minds, conſcious of having done their duty, and yet, in a daring manner, accuſed of what their ſouls utterly abhor; and who, if they have erred, are deeply conſcious, that it cannot be aſcribed to their intentions, and that their conduct in the whole of this matter hath ſtood at the utmoſt diſtance from artful deſign.

Having made theſe obſervations, the diſcourſe, together with the preſbytery's objections againſt it, falls now under review.

One thing thought greatly wrong, through the whole of the diſcourſe, was its *general ſtrain*. In *this* there appears an almoſt total neglect of the goſpel, while a general idea of religion, properly natural, is ſubſtituted in its place. And this is the more remarkable, when it is conſidered, that it is propoſed, as a *ſtated and principal aim*, to illuſtrate the tendency of pure religion before God and the Father, from what is called, in the diſcourſe, "all thoſe manifeſtations which God hath made in favour of the degenerate children of men." Beſides *this*,—great ignorance, or miſrepreſentation, of ſcripture truth; and even very great local ignorance of holy ſcripture itſelf, is apparent upon the face of moſt of the illuſtrations.

In unfolding *theſe* objections againſt the general ſtrain of the diſcourſe, the particular objections, as ſtated in the minutes, will ariſe to view in their proper order.

Mr Addie ſets out, in the introduction, with an account of the "great aim" of the apoſtle James in his

epiſtle. He tells us—it "is to exhibit religion as of an active nature; and that it diſcovers itſelf in heart and conduct by a patient perſeverance in rectitude; and that the reward of this perſeverance is ſure and laſting." In the whole of his account we have not ſo much as one hint of that which was *indeed* the Apoſtle's principal view, viz. to repreſent faith in Chriſt, or the Chriſtian faith, as *that* active and animating principle: and this ſeems the more ſurpriſing, not only as *that* is aſſerted in ſuch ſtrong and diverſified expreſſions in the epiſtle itſelf, but, as it was natural to think, if the Apoſtle was writing to Chriſtians, when he mentions pure and undefiled religion, he muſt mean the Chriſtian religion:—But, in order, as it ſeems, to keep the Chriſtian religion out of view, we are told that the Apoſtle is writing "to Jews," without taking the leaſt notice, that, though they, to whom he wrote, were Jews by *nation*, yet, by *religion*, they were Chriſtians. Nor can any ſpecious apology, for this miſrepreſentation, take off, but rather add to, the weight of the objection. For though, it hath been ſaid, that, the Jewiſh Chriſtians, for the firſt and ſecond centuries, and more, were ſo much addicted to their national cuſtoms, that they mixed Judaiſm with Chriſtianity, yet, the aim of all the apoſtles was to take them off from *this*, to conſider them, in their addreſſes, as Chriſtians only, and to ſpeak and write to them in the ſpirit of the goſpel.——The Preſbytery think it better to plead ignorance, than thus to plead. Perhaps inadvertency may be pled: but the whole ſtrain of the introduction to the diſcourſe ſeems plainly to clear it from the charge of inadvertency; for even when the words of the context are quoted, "be ye doers of the word and not hearers only," and in conſequence, they "who only hear, and talk much about the goſpel" are animadverted upon: with the very next breath we are led to a vague and general idea of reli-

gion, as if it was *not* the goſpel, but ſome abſtract thing, *named* religion, that the Apoſtle had in view.

This ſame ſtrain is preciſely followed in the explication of the text*. We are told, "the words, God and the Father, are a Syriac form of expreſſion, and ſeem to expreſs only this,—God our Father," and (as if on purpoſe to guard againſt bringing in ideas properly Chriſtian) it is added, "if any think they reſpect the diſtinction of Father and Son, it makes no odds" This language the Preſbytery thought very ſtrange; but the ſentiment ſtranger ſtill.—For if it does reſpect the diſtinction of Father and Son, it makes a very great difference: and Mr Addie, by the very ſubject before him, was obliged to treat pure and undefiled religion, as the religion of God in Chriſt, reconciling the world to himſelf, and not imputing their treſpaſſes unto them. And that it does reſpect the diſtinction of Father and Son, wherever theſe words, "God and the Father," ſtand, as in the deſcription of the text, together, appears clearly evident.——The very texts which Mr Addie hath adduced, in chain, to ſupport his ſenſe, ſtand as ſo many convincing proofs of this important truth: for in them the conjunctive particle points him out as the Father of Chriſt, and as our Father: And when in the text, and elſewhere alſo, he is pointed out, by way of eminence, as God and *the* Father, it cannot but be juſtly argued, not only, that no view of God, in which he is Father, can be excluded, but alſo, that it certainly means, to give the moſt eminent view of him as ſuch; and *that*, if we believe the Chriſtian revelation, is, moſt certainly, as the Father of Chriſt; and therefore we are baptized in the name of the Father, and in the name of the Son. But Mr Addie, to ſupport his notion of pure and undefiled religion, even granting this, ſays, "If any think the words God and the Father reſpect the diſtinction of Father and Son, it makes no

* See p. 5. of the foregoing ſermon.

odds:" And therefore, agreeable to ſuch an aſſertion, ſums up the whole ſubject of the text in the following doctrine, viz. "It is the intention of all true religion to recommend mercy and holineſs." And who doubts that ſuch is indeed the intention of all true religion? But is *this indefinite notion* (that equally ſuits every thing that's true in heatheniſm, and in all the different names of religion in the world, as well as the whole of Chriſtianity) the meaning of the text, or agreeable to the intention of the apoſtle? He muſt either not have read the epiſtle, or be incapable of apprehending the train and connection of the Apoſtle's ideas, or diſpoſed to diſregard his meaning, who can affirm this.——The Apoſtle's great aim is obvious,—to exhort to ſteady perſeverance in all the active duties of the Chriſtian life, and to exhibit, as the foundation of this, a character founded upon internal principle, viz. "being begotten of the will of God, by the word of truth," ver. 18. being the workmanſhip of God, created again by his Spirit and word in Jeſus Chriſt. Upon this foundation, it is the deſign of what he writes, to ſhew, that adherence to Chriſt and the goſpel, conformity to the religion of the *word* ("the perfect law of liberty," which is pure and undefiled before God and the Father, or founded upon the exhibition of God as the *Father of Chriſt, and our Father in Chriſt*) is the only proof of the reality of faith in Chriſt; and that the reward of perſeverance in duty, upon this foundation, is ſure and laſting, "is a crown of life, which the Lord hath promiſed to them that love him." Upon theſe principles it is, that the Apoſtle is alſo, in this epiſtle, putting the Chriſtians, of the Jewiſh diſperſion, upon their guard againſt the baſe and immoral doctrines and practices of the Gnoſtics, and other licentious profeſſors of Chriſtianity, which many of them had diſcovered too great a readineſs to fall in with: and exhorting them to ſhew ſtedfaſtly their faith in Jeſus Chriſt by

their works; becauſe, that where works were wanting, there was a direct and evident proof, that knowledge and faith were dead, and good for nothing.

If Mr Addie had, in this, or in any way explicit and congruous to the deſign of the epiſtle, traced out the aim of the Apoſtle, and true meaning of the text, he would have been obliged to treat of pure and undefiled religion, in ſome manner agreeable to its determinate idea in the text, as the religion of Jeſus Chriſt; which every thing, already obſerved, ſhews he had no mind to do.—And this the preſbytery thought more particularly evident, when his deſcription of the *great object of religion*, which now of courſe falls under conſideration, is attended to.

All the account he gives of the great object of religion is*, that it is the "divine nature." In *this*, he is indeed intirely conſiſtent with himſelf; and there is no name of religion, under the heavens, but to which this will exactly agree. Any illuſtration he gives of this divine nature, is no more than what is given by natural religion. He claims indeed to reaſon, as diſtinct from revelation, ſuch diſcoveries of goodneſs, in regard to pardoning mercy (afterwards to be conſidered) as are contrary to truth, and the experience of all ages; and puts reaſon, at leaſt, upon the ſame footing with revelation, in reſpect to this grand diſcovery of the goſpel: but that which is characteriſtical of the religion of "the word," which is pure and undefiled, before God and the Father, is, that, where the diſcoveries of nature, and the reſearches of reaſon, leave us in the dark, and we muſt add, this account of the great object of religion, now under review, *it* glorioufly diſplays, both what the divine nature is, in itſelf, and in reſpect to men, in particular, as ſinners. Reaſon and the religion of nature may, like our candidate, in his illuſtration of this great object, talk, in general terms, of mercy, and the

* See p. 7, and 8. of the foregoing ſermon.

hope of reward, under divine government; and perhaps they could not even do ſo much, were they not ſtored with ideas, borrowed from divine revelation, and unacknowledged: but it is the word of God, and the goſpel alone, that reveals the *divine nature* in that light, and in thoſe relations, in which God only can be the great object of the religion of man, who is a ſinner, and appear unto him merciful and gracious.

Suppoſing our candidate had been a Catechumen, in the pure days of the primitive church, in order to be admitted to the common privileges of a Chriſtian—can it be thought, that, if he had not given another account of the great object of religion, and of the hope of mercy and reward under his government, he could have been admitted to the common privileges of a Chriſtian? We think not. If ſo, in what light would he have been conſidered, had he been a candidate for a higher ſtation? The great object of religion, which his own ſtated method bound him to deſcribe, and which he was alſo bound to exhibit by the ſituation in which he ſtood, as on trials for the miniſtry of the goſpel, was God in Chriſt, and as revealed and diſcovered in his word. Whatever falls ſhort of this, in a ſet deſcription, though it may be true in general, yet it cannot, properly, be called the great object of pure and undefiled religion, before God and the Father, viz. the Chriſtian religion.—The divine Nature, in the perſons of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is the great object of the Chriſtian religion, and pervades it wholly. The oeconomy of redemption ſtands on this view of the Deity only, and the application of it acknowledges *this* alone as its foundation. So ſenſible were the primitive Chriſtians of this important truth, that they converted the words of the baptiſmal inſtitution into the form of a creed, and held it as the ſymbol of the credible profeſſion of Chriſtianity; and a long time paſſed before any other articles were added to their creed. If this is true, what

would they have thought of a candidate who ſhould have, in a ſtated manner, deſcribed the great object of religion under the general name of the divine Nature only; and, in the whole of a diſcourſe upon trials, on a ſubject which obliged him to deſcribe *that object*, as a Chriſtian, pay not the ſmalleſt regard to, at leaſt, the Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as eſſential to that object at all? But,

As the view given us of the great object of religion, is ſuch as repreſents none of the peculiar diſcoveries of the goſpel concerning it;———ſo, if matters of fact are attended unto, it ſeems very diſputable upon the principles of *reaſon*, to which he appeals.

We are told*, that "all true religion, both natural "and revealed, repreſents God to us, as a Being of "the moſt perfect purity and goodneſs: He is the "holy One that inhabits eternity: He is the Lord "God merciful and gracious, who pardons iniquity "and ſin." But is it matter of fact, that natural religion thus repreſents the goodneſs of God, as including in it the idea of pardoning mercy? Which of the wiſeſt of men, unenlightened by revelation, ever made this diſcovery, ſo as to hold it for certain truth?——It is true, Mr Addie goes on with the period in the following manner,——"Thus is he repreſented by revela-"tion;"—but he had alſo ſaid, as above, by "both "natural and revealed religion." And, then, he goes on with his *reaſon* for this, viz. an argument *a priori*, "For it is impoſſible, that he who is poſſeſſed of infi-"nite power, ſhould not be infinitely good and holy." The truth is, this, and all other arguments *a priori*, with regard to God, when put to the teſt of common ſenſe, ſeem to be nothing elſe, but arguments *a poſteriori*, or from revelation caſt into metaphyſical form. And *this*, in particular, of the impoſſibility of a being of infinite power, who ſhould not be infinitely good and

* See p. 8. of the foregoing ſermon.

holy, as infinite goodneſs includes in it the idea of pardoning mercy, is evidently one of theſe metaphyſical efforts, which, having firſt ſtollen from the treaſures of the goſpel, immediately holds it as the property of the reaſoning powers, and makes them carry about in triumph as their own, what, in reality, is the peculiar property, and the peculiar glory, too, of revelation. The only way we can know the power of reaſon, in this matter, to diſcover the impoſſibility of infinite power without infinite goodneſs, in the ſupreme Being, is by what reaſon hath actually done, when unaſſiſted by the light of revelation. Here we muſt appeal to facts. Upon the principles of reaſon, as appeared to them, ſome of the moſt ancient nations, and many ancient philoſophers, held, what afterwards was the execrable doctrine of the Manicheans, two omnipotent beings, the one infinitely good, and the other infinitely evil *. And ſo powerful a bias is there in unaſſiſted reaſon this way, that, for many centuries, the Manicheans were a moſt numerous body, even, in the Chriſtian world; and many of them remain in the Eaſt to this day. Now, when, with *this*, it is conſidered, that the very beſt of the ancient philoſophers could form no notion of the divine placability, that, even themſelves could depend upon, it ſeems clearly evident into what ſcale the utmoſt extent of mere human reaſon has actually thrown its weight. The beſt that can be ſuppoſed, ſeems to be, that it ſuſpends deciſion, the ſubject being infinitely beyond its line. But, as to the argument with which the candidate ſupports his aſſertion, ſhallow, indeed, muſt the extent of human reaſon be, if it could not diſcover it both ſophiſtical in form, and

* See Moſheim's Church Hiſtory in thoſe centuries, where he gives an account of the riſe and progreſs of the Manichean hereſy.

See alſo Tillotſon's ſermon on the unity of the divine Nature, and bleſſed Trinity.

falſe in fact: "It is, ſaith he, the weakneſs of earthly "potentates that renders them ſuſpicious, cruel, and "revengful: Every commotion among their ſubjects "makes their thrones to ſhake," &c. But what has the feeble power of the greateſt and moſt abſolute monarchs of the earth, whoſe breath is in their noſtrils, in any way conſidered, to do, in proof of what is ſaid "impoſſible" not to be, with him that is almighty? And, is it not well known, that many ſovereigns, who never ſat upon a tottering throne, have been, by natural temper only, ſuſpicious, cruel, and revengeful? In fact, when reaſon would fathom the line of Deity, it muſt either ſink into abſurdity, or, as to the brighteſt glories of the divine Nature, make its humble acknowledgments at the ſhrine of revelation. 'Tis here alone, that it can trace the inſeparable connection of infinite goodneſs with almighty power, and perceive *that* goodneſs, infinite indeed, which is adorned with the glory of pardoning mercy. 'Tis here alſo, the impoſſibility of two ſovereign oppoſite beings, the one infinitely good, and the other infinitely evil, clearly appears, of which, when diſcovered, reaſon can trace the ground; and, on this, all will reſt with joyful acquieſcence, who are not blinded with prejudices. But, (as in the diſcourſe under review) to put natural religion, reaſon, and revealed religion, upon the ſame footing, either plainly, or in artful periods, is uſual enough to paſs off a piece of compoſition, which, under the ſhadow of a ſcripture text, claims to be regarded as a goſpel ſubject.

If we purſue the ſtrain of this diſcourſe, with reſpect to the tendency of that view, given in it, of the great object of religion,—if holy ſcripture be true, we ſhall find it utterly incapable of operating, upon men, the effects aſcribed to it.

After being told, that the great object religion preſents us with, is, "the divine Nature," it is immediately

(by a new kind of Engliſh conſtruction) added, "from "*him* we derived our exiſtence; by his providence we "have been ſupported;——from his bounty we ex- "pect whatever happineſs yet awaits us;——all our "truſt and dependence is upon his goodneſs." But we muſt here aſk, how truſt in his goodneſs? Sinners, dead in treſpaſſes and in ſins, children of wrath, even as others;——and without a Mediator too? Not one word of a Mediator in the whole of our preacher's diſcourſe. Though, how it is poſſible to deſcribe the religion of a ſinner without a Mediator; and how a candidate's trial, upon true and undefiled religion before God and the Father, in order to his being a miniſter of the goſpel, could be ſuſtained, whilſt it does not appear that *this* bears any ſhare in the efficacy of true religion in the ſoul of man, *according to his ideas*, we leave to our ſuperiors, and to the impartial world, to judge?

But, to go forward with the diſcourſe,——"We "hope for rewards in a future ſtate under his govern- "ment; and we know, that theſe will not be beſtowed "indiſcriminately; but will be beſtowed on thoſe who "are poſſeſſed of a heart and temper that is acceptable "to God: We may reſt aſſured, that God will beſtow "the good things of the future world on thoſe minds "which bear the greateſt reſemblance to himſelf." True. But, if we have no other view of the great object of religion, but what this diſcourſe gives us, conſidering that we are guilty ſinners, we can never either be rewarded, or be like God; for eternal life is the gift of God, and *that* only, through the Mediator Jeſus Chriſt.——And the likeneſs of God is produced in us by the *Holy Spirit*, which neither in name, perſon, nor office, makes any part of the object, or is held requiſite to the influence of *that* religion we are preſented with in this diſcourſe. Well. But, by and by, we are told how we come to be poſſeſſed of this like-

neſs.——" A regard to God is a great and leading " principle of all religion: If he be a God of love and " mercy, who has conferred great favours upon our- " ſelves, as all true religion diſcovers him to be, then our " affections towards him muſt conſiſt of love, grati- " tude, and veneration." Now, " we naturally imitate " that being whom we love and admire; in *this man-* " *ner* *, every great and amiable character forms infe- " rior minds into a reſemblance of itſelf." And is it indeed ſo? Is this, indeed, the manner, according to the true and undefiled religion of Jeſus Chriſt, by which the children of God are formed into the likeneſs of their heavenly Father?

The progreſs is truly obvious. Great favours from a God of love and mercy, conferred upon ourſelves, beget love; love naturally diſpoſes to imitation; and imitation produces the likeneſs; and, leſt we ſhould imagine, that the influence of ſome divine and ſpiritual principle, given us, might lye concealed among theſe favours, and lend a helping hand, the candidate tells us, his meaning is, that all this comes to paſs " in the ſame " manner, as every great and amiable character forms " inferior minds into a reſemblance of itſelf." But this cannot be believed, while the Apoſtle will declare, that " the natural man receiveth not the things of the " Spirit of God: for they are fooliſhneſs unto him; " neither can he know them; for they are ſpiritually " diſcerned †;" which holds equally true of what is, properly, the effects of the Spirit of God in the ſouls of men, as of the doctrines of the goſpel to which the Apoſtle directly applies it: nor can we believe it, while the Apoſtle ſays, " The love of God is ſhed abroad in " our hearts by the Holy Ghoſt ‡;" and that it is thoſe only who are led by the Spirit of God, that are the ſons of God, and are, thereby, like him, being " born not of

* See p. 9. of the foregoing ſermon. † 1 Cor. ii. 14. ‡ Rom. v. 5.

blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God *. But the Holy Ghost is regarded neither as the object, nor efficient, in the religion of this discourse.

We shall now proceed to what is said of the "tendency of all those manifestations, which God has "made in favour of the degenerate children of men, "to recommend mercy and holiness.".

Upon this head, the presbytery could not help remarking, that the strain appeared not only grosly defective; but, in instances not a few, there appeared, at least, surprising ignorance, if not something worse.

Here, one should have naturally expected, the manifestation of God, in the covenant of grace, by the *promised seed*, to have taken the lead. But no such thing. This manifestation seems to be utterly unknown, at least, greatly misunderstood, through the whole of the discourse; and, bating the mention, at the conclusion, of the love of God in Christ to die for us, there is nothing that has the most distant relation to it at all. But of *that* in its proper place.

We are led to the Mosaic constitution, and "the great number of sacrifices†," in the first written revelation which God gave *to men*, viz. that given to the *Israelites* by the means of Moses. As to these, we are told, "now, "one great intention of many of these sacrifices, at "least, was evidently to promote a spirit of mercy. He "who offered them, was enjoined to invite the stranger, the fatherless, the widow, and the Levite who "had no inheritance, with his brethren, to all the "feasts upon free-will offerings;" and quotes, as his authority for *this*, Deut. xii. 17.—What is said, with respect to one great intention of many of these sacrifices, "at least," to promote a spirit of mercy, the candidate says also, "was the spirit of the Jewish institu-"tions in many other respects;" and points out a va-

* Rom. viii. 14. John i. 13. † See p. 10. of the foregoing sermon.

riety of them, to ſhew that *this* was their great purpoſe.

Now, upon *this*, the following things cannot but be obſerved.

1*mo*, That the reaſon he does not aſſert, that *all the Jewiſh inſtitutions* have the ſame tendency, is, evidently, becauſe he never conſiders, that law changes the quality of actions.

2*do*, That what, without law, would be an expreſſion of the ſpirit of mercy, under the obligation of law, becomes an act of juſtice.

3*tio*, Therefore—he conſiders the expreſſions of this ſpirit of mercy, as conſiſting in their feaſts, to which were invited, the poor, the fatherleſs, and widow, &c. and in their other proviſions for the relief of the poor, the inſolvent, and the diſtreſſed. More than this, as to any intention of them, or as to what they, in truth, were, in the eye of the law of God, he ſays nothing at all. And no other reaſon can poſſibly be aſſigned, why he ſpeaks of many of the ſacrifices, "at leaſt," as tending to promote the ſpirit of mercy, but, becauſe, in ſome caſes, the actions that muſt attend them, had they been from under the conſtraint of law, might have been conſidered as of the charitable kind; as, particularly, at their feaſts upon free-will offerings, at their great anniverſary ſolemnities, *which, by our candidate, are falſely aſſerted to be eſſential to their conſtitution in general.* The ſame notion alſo led him to attempt to prove, but by one kind of ſacrifices, what he had aſſerted with reſpect to many of them "at leaſt."

We ſhall now attend him in theſe views,——Firſt, in reſpect to ſacrifices; and, then, in reſpect to the other inſtitutions, he mentions, in courſe.

As to ſacrifices, the proof he brings, is the free-will offerings, only.—But, according to the authority cited by him ("Deut. xii. 17.*") what is aſſerted concern-

* See p. 10. of the foregoing ſermon.

ing the free-will offerings, is not true. There we are expreſsly told, the feaſts upon them were to be of the houſehold kind; and none but the family, who offered, or to which the offerer belonged, and the Levite, who was one of that family, and was their miniſter, and teacher in holy things, was, agreeably to the inſtitution there recorded, to partake of them. And, we are aſſured, the Levite was to partake of them, not as having an act of mercy diſpenſed unto him by the offerer, but in claim of juſtice, being the family's miniſter in holy things, and one of the family too, and having no inheritance with them, had a right to his reward. It is hardly poſſible not to think, that Mr Addie has cited this text at ſecond hand, from ſome favourite author, and not looked into his Bible.

He goes on, "And that he (viz. the offerer) might "have no temptation to apply his ſacrifice for other "purpoſes, (viz. than feaſting with the ſtranger, the "fatherleſs, the poor, and the widow, &c.) he is com-"manded to eat it upon the ſame day on which it was "offered*." If it appears from the authority above quoted, that this was not the purpoſe of it, it being not therein required, then *this reaſon*, aſſigned for eating it ſpeedily, cannot be true: it muſt have its riſe in the nature of free-will offerings, whatever *that* reaſon be, which one ſhould think, from their very name, imply the propriety of diſpatching them quickly; and accordingly, by the teſtimony adduced in the diſcourſe, the fleſh of the ſacrifice of peace-offerings, for thankſgiving, is ordered to be eaten the ſame day that it is offered:—Why? no doubt, as for other reaſons, ſo, particularly, becauſe of the generous, and animated nature of thankfulneſs to God, to whom it is offered, and its impatience of reſerve in expreſſion. But ſo unfortunate is Mr Addie at citing ſcripture, that, in the very next verſe, ver. 16. the law concerning free-will offerings

* Lev. vii. 15.

ſtands clearly in oppoſition to him;—"but, if the ſacri-
" fice of his offering be a vow, or *a voluntary offering*,
" it ſhall be eaten the ſame day that he offereth his ſa-
" crifice; and on the morrow alſo the remainder of it
" ſhall be eaten."—Any one well acquainted with his Bible, muſt know, that, in any other part where the law of free-will offerings is mentioned, it ſtands expreſsly in the ſame terms.

But, to go on with the diſcourſe, "The tithes of
" their ground were applied to the ſame purpoſe: E-
" very man was obliged to give a ſolemn proteſtation,
" before God, that he had applied them properly*." Where was his Bible when the canditate wrote this? The tithes, in general, were the property of the Levites, Numb. xviii. 21. What is here ſaid by him is true only of the tithes of every third year, which were, by God's right to explain or diſpenſe with his own laws, not to be offered in the place where he "put his name there," but to be retained at home, the poſſeſſors of grounds, *in that caſe*, being God's truſtees for the poor; of the diſcharge of which truſt, in a faithful way, they were afterwards to make ſolemn proteſtation. Witneſs, *for this*, the very ſcriptures cited by himſelf, Deut xiv. 22, 28, 29. and Deut. xxvi. 12,—16.

In one word, the offering of the firſt fruits, the feaſting at the feaſt of tabernacles, as well as the third year's tithing, were, all of them, expreſſions of the mercy of God to the poor, the widow, &c. Upon the part of the land-holder, they were but part of his quitrent to God, the proprietor and ſovereign, from whom he held his charter, or leaſe of his grounds; he held his lands by that tenure, and there was a claim at law againſt him for them, as well as for vaſtly more appropriated to the ſervice of God, to the prieſts, the Levites, and other officers of his houſehold: This is the very light in which God himſelf, by the prophet Malachi, conſi-

* See p. 10. of the foregoing ſermon.

ders theſe inſtitutions, with reſpect to offerings and ſacrifices of every kind. They had offered polluted bread upon his altar; they had offered the blind, the lame, the ſick cattle, in ſacrifice; for *this* God upbraids them with direct injuſtice, "Do ye kindle fire on mine altar for nought? ſaith the Lord. Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye ſay, wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are curſed with a curſe; for ye have robbed me; even this whole nation." Mal. i. 7, 8, 10. iii. 8, 9.

So that compliance with all theſe inſtitutions, was no more than a plain act of juſtice; unleſs it be an act of mercy for a tenant to pay his rent, and fulfil his civil obligations; or a ſubject to ſubmit to the authority of the ſovereign, and live according to the laws of his country.

Every one, and all, of the other inſtitutions, mentioned under this head, muſt be conſidered preciſely in the ſame light; and were no other than legal eſtabliſhments in favour of the poor, or in ſupport of the *peculiar conſtitution* of that nation. And this is very remarkable even in free-will offerings, the only inſtitution in which the rigour of legal preſcriptions was abated, that though circumſtances were to determine the quantity of them, yet, in their general nature, and according to the occaſions of offering them, they are expreſsly conſidered as a tribute*, to be paid unto the Lord, the ſovereign, and to be feaſted upon, in a joyful religious manner, according to the oeconomy and regulations of his houſehold.

We need not, after all that hath been ſaid, be greatly ſurpriſed at the manner in which Mr Addie hath ſummed up this head of his diſcourſe. "In this manner (ſaith he) did God, by means of Moſes, inculcate "the glow of affections in ritual obſervations, and po- "litical inſtitutions: the rites themſelves were of *ſmall*

* Deut. xvi. 10.

" *value;* it was the mercy and charity, with which they " were accompanied, that were acceptable to God*." What! Is that of *ſmall value*, the withholding of which, or not offering that which was good in quality, according to the judgment of God himſelf, is robbery? Is it of ſmall value to paſs, or not to pay, the taxes for the ſupport of the national government, and the houſehold eſtabliſhment of the prince, to diſcharge our civil obligations, and live according to the laws of our country?

The only excuſe we can make for our candidate is, that, through every part of this head, it ſeems very evident he hath taken the whole of his notions from ſecond hand, and it is likely he thought it very troubleſome to look into the Bible after a ſet of obſolete inſtitutions. Whatever he thought, it ſeems plain, even to demonſtration, he hath not conſulted his Bible.

On this head he has many quotations of ſcripture. Let us ſee how they turn out. We have already clearly ſhown, that his citations from Deut. xii. 17. Lev. vii. 15. Deut. xiv. and xxvi. chap. are brought by him in proof of what is not only not ſaid in theſe texts, but is contrary to them. He underſtands the feaſt of tabernacles, and the feaſt of weeks, or Pentecoſt, to be the ſame, by his citing Deut. xvi. 9. for the feaſt of tabernacles, which is expreſsly that of weeks. For his authority about the beating of the olive-tree, he cites Deut. xxii. 19. which ſtatutes the puniſhment of the perſon who defames his wife, "The elders of the city," to which he belongs, "ſhall amerce him in a hundred ſhekels of ſilver," &c. Deut. xv. 7. is quoted for the law of lending money without intereſt†: but there is nothing about the intereſt of money there, or in the whole of that chapter. Exod. xxii. 11. is brought as voucher, that the ſpontaneous produce of every ſeventh year, "not inconſiderable in better climes" was the property of the poor: but there is nothing of this in the whole of that

* See p. 11. of the foregoing ſermon. † See p. 10.

chapter; and in the 11 ver. particularly, is the law directing how to proceed in caſes of the ſuſpicion of damage. What ſhall we ſay to theſe and other inſtances of his knowledge of the Bible? But, as more of theſe occur afterwards, we ſhall now proceed to his doctrine concerning EXPIATORY Sacrifices.

It is expreſſed as follows.

" Every thing in their law was in oppoſition to moral defilement, and *all* their expiatory ſacrifices, " however they came to miſtake them, were intended " *chiefly* to remove this pollution, and to convince " them of its odious and hainous nature*". Had he not been inſiſting, on purpoſe, upon the tendency of the Jewiſh ceremonies to promote holineſs, and enforce purity and uprightneſs, we ſhould have been apt to think he had blundered, as ſome have done before him, in confounding the ideas of pollution and guilt, of moral impurity and liableneſs to puniſhment: but the ſet purpoſe of this diſcourſe will not ſuffer any ſuch conſtruction.

The expiatory ſacrifices, of the Moſaic law, had a double reference. They were eſſential parts of the civil as well as religious conſtitution of the Jewiſh nation, which were ſo incorporated as to make but one political ſyſtem: but this was but an inferior intention of them,—they were figures, ſhadows, and ſymbolical repreſentations of that one ſacrifice of *Chriſt*, whereby he hath for ever perfected them that are ſanctified.

In regard to the political conſtitution of the Jews, which was, properly, a theocracy, there were ſin offerings, and treſpaſs offerings, two diſtinct claſſes of expiatory ſacrifices, to be offered,—the firſt in caſes of having unknowingly tranſgreſſed thoſe negative precepts of the law, which, if they had been tranſgreſſed knowingly, were to be puniſhed with death. Of theſe precepts the Jews reckon to the number of forty three.

* See p. 11. of the foregoing ſermon.

There were indeed certain ſin offerings preſcribed by the law, which come not properly under *this* their general deſcription,——ſuch as *that* in the conſecration of Aaron, Lev. ix. 2. and *that* for a woman when under purification, Lev. xii. 6. or *that* for a leper when under cleanſing.——Theſe ſeem to have been offered rather by way of precaution, leſt perhaps the perſons might be under guilt of which they were ignorant, that thus it might be expiated, and were therefore very much akin to treſpaſs offerings, by which name the ſin offering is called, Lev. v. 6.

The ſecond were ſo ſimilar to the firſt, as to the nature, cauſe, and occaſion, of the offering, that in moſt caſes, it ſeems hard to find out the ground of the diſtinction: for as the ſacrifice for ſin was offered in the caſe of tranſgreſſing theſe negative precepts, ſo was the ſacrifice for treſpaſs. As theſe were offered for ſins ignorantly committed, ſo were thoſe. As the ſin offering was ſacrificed in order to prevent the danger of exciſion, ſo was the treſpaſs offering. However, the difference, though not in nature, ſeems to have been founded in the degree of evidence with which the guilt was attended.

Of treſpaſs offerings there were two kinds.——The firſt in caſes where ſome doubt might ariſe as to the actual guilt, and ſome difficulties might *occur*, as to the queſtion, whether guilty of the treſpaſs or not. In this caſe, to avert the danger of exciſion, if it ſtill remained doubtful, after proper inquiry had been made, the perſon was obliged to offer his ſacrifice for treſpaſs*. If the guilt appeared evident, then he muſt offer a ſin offering.

The ſecond kind of treſpaſs offerings reſpected ſome ſpecial caſes aſcertained by the law, where it expreſsly pointed out the victim, the perſons, and occaſions, upon the account of which it muſt be offered. Of theſe caſes

* Lev. v. 17.

there are five in the law. 1. For ſome ſins done wittingly, Lev. vi. 2, 3, 6. 2. For ſacrilege ignorantly committed, Lev. v. 16. 3. For violating the chaſtity of a betrothed bond-maid, Lev. xix. 20, 21. 4. The treſpaſs offering of a Nazarite, Numb. vi. 12. 5. And that of a leper, Lev. xiv. 12. The rites were the ſame as thoſe of the ſin offering.

Beſides the ſin and treſpaſs offerings, there was alſo another kind of expiatory ſacrifices eſtabliſhed by the law, viz. burnt-offerings. As to the ſpecial intention of theſe, they were, according to the moſt learned among the Jews, for the expiation of impious and ſinful thoughts, like as the ſin and treſpaſs offerings expiated the guilt of evil actions: They were alſo for the expiation of tranſgreſſions againſt the affirmative precepts of the law, like as the others expiated the violations of the negative precepts. Theſe had a remarkable beauty in that political conſtitution, being moſt eminently adapted to the character and dignity of the Prince and Sovereign, the ſearcher of hearts, and who is delighted with truth in the inward parts, in all thoſe regards that are paid him. All theſe different kinds of expiatory ſacrifices were to be offered, according to circumſtances, for individuals, for the chief men in Iſrael, for the prieſts, for the judges, and for the body of the people: And the ſtated and legal purpoſe for which they were offered, according to the political conſtitution of the Jewiſh nation, was for the remiſſion of ſin, and for that only. This is every where expreſsly aſſerted in the law, particularly concerning the ſin and treſpaſs offerings in the iv, v, vi, and firſt ten verſes of the vii. chap. of Leviticus. And the ſame is true of burnt offerings, becauſe they alſo were expiatory ſacrifices, or "ſacrifices accepted to make atonement," Lev. i. 4. We cannot but, therefore, obſerve, that Mr Addie's doctrine, in reſpect to any, or, as he more ſtrongly expreſſes it, *all* the expiatory ſacrifices, is directly contrary to ſcrip-

ture. The doctrine of atoning ſacrifices, in regard to the political conſtitution of the Jewiſh nation, ſtands clearly thus.

The treſpaſs and ſin offerings were, in general, ſome few caſes excepted, to be offered for the expiation or remiſſion of ſins ignorantly committed againſt the negative precepts of the law, or, as in the words of the law itſelf, "againſt any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done," or "forbidden to be done *," which if tranſgreſſed, with knowlege and deſign, exciſion or death was the certain puniſhment. If, from any circumſtances whatever, there was a dubiety in the caſe, whether guilty or not, againſt any of theſe negative precepts; then the ſacrifice for treſpaſs muſt be offered. If, on the other hand, it clearly appeared to the perſon himſelf, or by the evidence of others, that he had been guilty, but without knowledge or deſign when the action was committed, then muſt his ſin offering be ſacrificed; and the prieſt herewith making atonement for him, his ſin "ſhall be forgiven him." But if he offered not his ſacrifice of ſin offering, upon conviction, he was liable to the penalty of wilful and deſigned tranſgreſſion—exciſion †. In the caſes even of ritual uncleanneſs, mentioned in the law ‡, ſeparation from communion in holy things took place until "purification for ſin" was made by the perſon, according to ſtatute, then was he clean, and readmitted to privileges accordingly; but in caſe of not purifying himſelf (as in the ſin offering, when there was clear proof of guilt that had been ignorantly contracted) "that ſoul, ſaith the law, ſhall be cut off from Iſrael ‖." And it is remarkable, that though, in the ſpecial caſes of wilful injury to a neighbour, as ſtated, Lev. vi. 1,——6. reſtitution with inte-

* Lev. iv. 27. and v. 17. † Vide Lightfoot oper. vol. 1. de miniſt. temp. Hieroſal. Edit. Rotterod. p. 702,——711.
‡ Numb. xix. ‖ Numb. xix. 13, 20.

reſt muſt be made, yet, the forgiveneſs of the guilt is directly aſcribed to the atonement with the ſacrifice before the Lord, and not to the reſtitution. Reparation of injuries from man to man is one object of the law: and reparation of the diſhonour and injury done to government is another. Agreeably to this, atonement with burnt offerings for tranſgreſſions of affirmative precepts, particularly, ſuch of them as could not fall under external cogniſance, or for ſins in the thoughts of the heart, appear with diſtinguiſhed propriety, as ſecuring the honour of that theocratical adminiſtration, the head and ſovereign of which was omniſcient. Thus does it clearly appear, that expiatory ſacrifices of every kind, according to the conſtitution of the Jewiſh government, were offered for the remiſſion of ſins, and for that end only; and they always had effect in the way of legal compenſation, to ſecure the honour of government, whilſt by them the obligation to temporal puniſhment was cancelled according to law. The ſmalleſt acquaintance with the books of Moſes will clearly evince this. Yea, Doctor Taylor himſelf will ſo far bear witneſs to this, as to declare*, "that ſin offerings, or piacular ſacrifices, were available to the forgiveneſs of ſins," tho', as to the manner in which he ſays they were available to that end, with our Bibles in our hands, we no more can believe it, than we can believe the doctrine of the diſcourſe under review,—"that the chief end of them "was to remove moral pollution."

As in all civil conſtitutions, even in capital crimes, ſome are juſtly conſidered as including a leſſer, and others a greater degree of guilt. Thus it was in the political conſtitution of the Jews. The ſins of a higher order were puniſhed by death, by the hand of Heaven, or by cutting off; ſo that ſuch as had ſinned in that kind, were to die without mercy, no ſacrifice being provided for them. Yet, when David had fallen into the moſt hainous of theſe ſins, he prays to God for a pardon†. Since

* Scripture doctrine of atonement, p. 21. † Pſal. li.

then it appears from the Apoſtle's reaſoning in the epiſtle to the Hebrews, that the Jews held it as a maxim, that, "without ſhedding of blood, there is no remiſſion of ſins." This muſt neceſſarily have led them to think, that there was ſome greater ſacrifice to be interpoſed, in order to the pardoning of theſe more hainous ſins; and, indeed, in order to the pardon of the guilt of all ſin whatever, in reſpect to the eternal conſequences of it in a future ſtate. If David had not had this in view, he had leſs occaſion to have been in ſuch diſtreſs: for, though he murdered Uriah, and was guilty of adultery with his wife; yet both the manner of the facts, and the circumſtances in which he ſtood, ſet him, at leaſt, above the external reach of law. In this view alſo, the prophets do often call the Jews to repent of their idolatry, and other crying ſins, for which their law provided no ſacrifice; and the prophecies of Iſaiah and Daniel ſet this matter in the cleareſt light.

Now, what is plain from *this*, as well as from *all the promiſes of Chriſt*, both before and under the Moſaic diſpenſation, is, that ſacrifices from the time that ſin entered into the world in the patriarchal age after the flood, before the law, and under the law of Moſes, were, all of them, according to the intention of God, the ſacrifice of Chriſt in ſymbol; and that, particularly, for this end, they were inſtituted of God as grand engines of government in the theocratical adminiſtration, in order that the temporal effects connected with them, in that conſtitution, in regard to leſſer ſins, or ſins in which there were alleviating circumſtances, might lead a ſtupid nation to a proper attention to the promiſes of the Meſſiah, and to his atoning ſacrifice, to which, both the letter and the ſpirit of their whole political conſtitution was calculated to lead.

God's intention, by ſacrifices, was alſo infinitely more extended than *this*. They were to be a ſtanding teſtimony to the whole world of mankind, yea, to the

whole intellectual creation of God, of the infinite conſequence of the expiatory ſacrifice of Chriſt under his univerſal adminiſtration. It is in this view the Apoſtle wrote the whole of his Epiſtle to the Hebrews. In this view, he tells us, the ſacrifice of Abel, as well as the ſacrifices of the law, doth conſtantly ſpeak.—They were figures and ſhadows of that *one* ſacrifice of Chriſt, whereby he hath for ever perfected them that are ſanctified. And in this faith, upon the teſtimony of God concerning the ſeed of the woman (for faith muſt reſpect teſtimony) Abel offered his ſacrifice; and therefore was accepted, "by which he, being dead, yet ſpeaketh," and will for ever ſpeak.

And though it was impoſſible that theſe ſhadows, the blood of bulls and of goats, and the aſhes of an heifer, ſprinkling the unclean, could produce an eternal effect as to the pardon of ſin, or obtaining redemption, yet they never failed, nor could they ever fail, in that conſtitution to which they belonged, to produce the temporal effect deſigned by them. "They did ſanctify to the purifying of the fleſh," or procure a temporal pardon in terms of law; and were thereby, and without this could not have been, proper types, ſhadows, and figures of the ſacrifice of Chriſt.

The figure of Chriſt, the Jewiſh ſacrifice, produced real temporal effects. The ſubſtance, the ſacrifice of Chriſt, effects ſpiritual and eternal. This is expreſsly, in terms, aſſerted by the Apoſtle to the Hebrews, ch. ix. 12, 13*.

Now, after what hath been ſaid, what can candour and ingenuity, with the greateſt allowances poſſible to

* It appeared neceſſary to be thus explicit, and to enter into particulars upon the article of Expiatory Sacrifices, becauſe, in a celebrated ſpeech at the ſynod at Irvine, whilſt the preſbytery were moſt vilely miſrepreſented, groſs darkneſs was caſt upon this ſubject: upon which account alſo it ſeems proper to pay a particular attention to any further views of it that caſt up in the diſcourſe.

a candidate for the miniſtry, make of his doctrine of *all* the expiatory ſacrifices of the law? They were, ſays he, "however they (the Jews) came to miſtake them," intended "*chiefly*" to remove moral pollution, and convince them of its hainous and odious nature. Here is a caveat, indeed, entered to ſupport his meaning againſt all oppoſition. The Jews miſtook the meaning of their own political conſtitution with regard to expiatory ſacrifices,—and Mr Addie puts that matter to rights.—But, in that view, they could no more miſtake the intention of theſe ſacrifices, than the ſubjects of Great Britain could be ſuppoſed to miſtake the meaning of an act of parliament they ſaw executed every day. The ſymbolical ſenſe of them, of which he has diſcovered no knowledge at all, they might miſtake, and, no doubt many of them did miſtake. But their temporal effects, in purifying the fleſh, or availing to the forgiveneſs of tranſgreſſions in terms of their law, they had every day occaſion to experience.

What is further added, as to the intention of their expiatory ſacrifices, viz. to convince them of the "hainous and odious nature*" of moral pollution or defilement, is either a contradiction in terms to their being chiefly intended to remove moral pollution, or an abſurdity in the nature of things. If he ſuppoſes there was a ſubſtitution of the ſacrifice in place of the offender, then, indeed, an inference of the hainous nature of tranſgreſſion might be deduced, in the ſame way, as from capital puniſhment may be inferred the hainous nature of the crime to which it correſponds: but this expreſsly contradicts his chief intention of them, to remove moral pollution, and manifeſts the chief intention of them to have been to procure pardon by the inflicting death upon the victim, inſtead of the offerer, in order, that hereby the honour of government might be ſupported; and, even in this caſe, it muſt be attended

* See p. 11. of the foregoing ſermon.

to, that the expiatory ſacrifices, of which he ſpeaks, were much oftner offered, in caſes of ceremonial default, than in thoſe of a moral nature, and could not be otherwiſe from the peculiar texture of the Jewiſh conſtitution.

Again, viewing *this* in any other light, it is evidently abſurd. The very act of offering any expiatory ſacrifice, reſpected conſcious guilt, and ſuppoſed the hainous nature of the ſin already known. To have offered in ſacrifice, but upon this foundation, would have been profaning an ordinance of God, and the nation and ſacrificing for nothing, and to no end. Accordingly, in the inſtitution of the ſin and treſpaſs offerings, and ſo, with reſpect to the reſt, the ſacrifice was only to be offered in conſequence of the conviction of ſin; for though it was for a ſin ignorantly committed; yet, before offering the ſacrifice, there was either to be certain knowledge, or, in the caſe of what is called treſpaſs, preponderating probability of the guilt. In all other caſes, acknowledged conviction was eſſentially neceſſary; and it was in conſequence of this only, that the ſacrifice could be offered according to law: and this held univerſally, whether the offering was made for an individual, for a family, or for the nation.

But to go on with the diſcourſe. "The ſame views "(we are told) are proſecuted by the prophets, *theſe* "*emancipated ſpirits* *, who made ſo vigorous a ſtand "againſt the corrupt doctrines and worſhip of their "times. The ſpirit of Moſes, the declarations of the "prophets, and the precepts of the author of the e"piſtle to the Hebrews, are the ſame: To do good, "and to communicate, forget not; for with ſuch ſacri"fices, God is well pleaſed."—What are we to underſtand by this,—viz.—That Moſes, the epiſtle to Hebrews, and the prophets, taught benevolence, and inculcated the expreſſing of this by kind and good offi-

* See p. 11. of the foregoing ſermon.

ces to men? True. So do all the ſacred writers: But what is this to the purpoſe of expiatory ſacrifices, of which the candidate is treating? And is his meaning, indeed, that the value of theſe did lye in benevolence, and ſocial acts of kindneſs from man to man?—What the true ſpirit of Moſes, the prophets, and the epiſtle to the Hebrews is, we have already ſeen. And, in that view, it is but right to attend to our bleſſed Saviour's eſtimate of the matter, John v. 46. "Had ye believed Moſes, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me." When he would inſtruct his diſciples with regard to his death and ſufferings, &c. Luke xxiv. 44,—48. he ſaid, "Theſe are the words I ſpake unto you, while I was with you, that all things muſt be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moſes, and in the prophets, and in the pſalms concerning me." And it is remarkable, that this is reckoned by him, by way of eminence,—to underſtand the ſcriptures. Of the ſame mind was the Apoſtle, Gal. iii. 24. "The law was our ſchoolmaſter to bring us unto Chriſt:" Therefore to attend unto the law, was to learn Chriſt. And, Rom. iii. 21. "Now the righteouſneſs of God without the law is manifeſted, being witneſſed by the law and the prophets."

Of a piece with *this*, is what we are immediately told were the views of the prophets, *theſe emancipated ſpirits*, as they are called. "Iſaiah, it is ſaid, inſiſted "ſtrongly on the vanity of ſacrifices, oblations, Sab- "baths, and appointed feaſts, in thoſe men whoſe hands "were full of blood and cruelty; but exhorts them "to that *frame of mind which ſtamps theſe performances with value**. As to this, there are two things to be attended to, viz. the ſentiment which is aſcribed to this *emancipated ſpirit*,—and the fact with reſpect to his exhortations. As to the ſentiment, that the frame of mind ſtamps theſe performances with value. Suppoſing it here to be underſtood of actions performed in o-

* See p. 12. of the foregoing ſermon.

bedience to the ordinances of God; though truth in the inward parts is indiſpenſibly requiſite in all *religious* performances; yet, in all our doings,—when we do the beſt, *we are ſtill unprofitable ſervants*. The ſentiment, as here applied to ſacrifices, is indeed the modern doctrine, and taken in conjunction with what is ſaid, as to the intention of all the expiatory ſacrifices *chiefly*, as it is nearly the words, ſo it is expreſsly the ſentiment of Doctor Taylor*: "Sacrifices were a ſymbolical addreſs to God, intended to expreſs before him the devotion, affections, diſpoſitions and deſires of the heart;" and "ſin offerings, or piacular ſacrifices, were available to the forgiveneſs of ſins†." "And, to me, it ſeems ſufficiently to account for the efficacy of piacular ſacrifices, that, in the ſight of God, and with regard to his acceptance, the prieſt made atonement for ſin, by ſacrificing a beaſt, only as that was a ſign and teſtimony of the ſacrificer's *pure and upright heart*, or of the pious diſpoſition which the religious ſhedding of blood, and other ſacrifical rites *ſuggeſted to him*‡." Here is the frame of mind, ſtamping value, with a witneſs. Only it looks much, as if the Doctor had eſpouſed the doctrine of the church of Rome about ſacerdotal intention, making the benefit of the ſacrifice depend upon the mind of the prieſt; for "the *prieſt ſacrificed* the beaſt;" and it was efficacious with God to pardon, "only as that was a ſign and teſtimony of *the ſacrificer's* pure and upright heart." The truth is, it is much about one, as if he had ſaid, it depended upon the pure and upright heart of the perſon for whom it was ſacrificed. Both are equally falſe. For what ſays God himſelf to this? Lev. xvii 11. "The life of the fleſh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make atonement for your ſouls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the ſoul." That

* Scripture doctrine of atonement, p. 20. † Id. p. 21. ‡ Id. ibid. and p. 22.

That is, the life of the beaſt is taken, inſtead of the life of the man; the ſacrifice dies, and upon this account the guilt is pardoned,—as every one who underſtands any thing of the languages muſt know. Now, whether muſt we believe God, or the Doctor? "I have given, ſaith God," &c. ſuch is my appointment, and who can gainſay my authority, or impeach my wiſdom? who can bring accuſations againſt the juſtice of my adminiſtration, whilſt ſecuring the honour of government, I extend the arms of mercy?

If we conſider atoning ſacrifices as grand engines of the theocratical government, and eſſential to the political conſtitution of the Jewiſh nation,—temporal pardon, or "purifying of the fleſh," as the Apoſtle, according to the idiom of the Septuagint tranſlation, calls it, always was, and, in the nature of government, always muſt have been immediately effected by the ſacrifice, in terms of law, let the frame and diſpoſition of the heart, with which it was offered, be whatever it would. The Doctor himſelf, when he gets clear of the duſt he had raiſed upon this ſubject, expreſsly acknowledges this*; and, alſo, that it was in this light, preciſely, the Apoſtle to the Hebrews conſidered them*. This ſtates the ſubject upon a proper footing, and brings it to a ſhort iſſue.

The only other light, then, in which theſe ſacrifices can be conſidered, is the *religious*. And though the Doctor had ſupported his doctrine with proofs taken from the political conſtitution, now *that* is given up, it is in the religious light only, it ſeems, that we are to take what he (and after him the diſcourſe under review) ſays about the frame of heart. But if the frame of the offerer's heart was available to the forgiveneſs of ſins, what need of ſacrifice? No, ſays the Doctor, it was the prieſt that made atonement for ſin, by ſacrificing a beaſt, as *that* was a ſign and teſtimony of the offerer's

* Scripture doctrine of atonement, p. 73.

pure and upright heart, &c. ſo, here, the ſign and teſtimony of the heart does, it ſeems, what the ſubſtance itſelf, without that ſign, could not do. The ſign of a good heart, made by the hands of a prieſt, is available; but the good heart, ſimply in itſelf, it ſeems, is not available to pardon. Apply this to the teſt of common ſenſe, and who can believe it, who ought not for the very ſame reaſons to believe the nonſenſe of tranſubſtantiation? The truth is, in a religious ſenſe, they were only available to forgiveneſs of ſins, as having a direct reſpect to the ſacrifice of Chriſt, of which they were figures and ſymbols. And when they were at all accepted of God, in the religious ſenſe, it was the ſacrifice of Chriſt that alone was the proper and formal cauſe of their acceptance. They were not ſigns and teſtimonies of the pious diſpoſition of the offerer, but tokens of his guilt, and need of a ſacrifice proportioned thereto, and were applications to that very ſacrifice in ſymbol, through the blood of which we have redemption, even the eternal forgiveneſs of ſins.

The offerer, indeed, might not clearly apprehend the nature of the ſacrifice to which they referred, as the ſhadow is a very imperfect portrait of the ſubſtance; but ſtill he underſtood, that it was to mercy through blood, the value of which, in availing to the forgiveneſs of ſins, was adequate to the honour of divine government; and this he could not but know, if, according to the Apoſtle, it was a ſtanding Jewiſh maxim, that, without ſhedding of blood, there is no forgiveneſs of ſins. In a word, if expiatory ſacrifices, in the religious ſenſe, are conſidered as figures of Chriſt's atoning ſacrifice, or as that very ſacrifice exhibited in ſymbol,——what ſhall we ſay? is it the frame of heart in man, conſcious of his guilt, that ſtamps that ſacrifice with value? then we needed not that ſacrifice, and Chriſt hath died in vain. Is it the frame even of a believer's heart, or of one who makes the penitent applications of faith to it,

that, even in reſpect to himſelf, ſtamps that ſacrifice with value? then is the believer, the penitent, his own Saviour; and his frame, his diſpoſition, his heart, his devotion, being ſo very good, he has no need of Chriſt for pardon, nor for reforming, and renewing his heart.

But to go on with the diſcourſe.

The exhortations of the prophet Iſaiah, brought in proof of what is aſſerted about the frame of mind, are the i. ch. 17. and the lvii. from the 5th verſe. Here it cannot but be obſerved, that the firſt of theſe exhortations has nothing in it to the purpoſe. And by applying the candidates doctrine to the ſecond, he ſanctifies idolatry itſelf. In the firſt, allowing him the benefit of the whole context,—the true view of the whole is this: Sacrifices, oblations, Sabbaths, and appointed feaſts, were inſtitutions that laid the people under higheſt obligations to God, both for the civil privileges connected with them, and for the ſpiritual and divine things of which they were ſymbols. Every civil ordinance of the Jewiſh nation behoved to have a religious quality in it, becauſe God, as ſovereign of the country, was legiſlator: to his honour, according to the conſtitution, they muſt be obeyed; and in his preſence, and under his eye, his people, as good citizens, muſt conform to all the laws of government; and the peculiar obligations they lay under to God for theſe privileges muſt alſo influence the whole of their moral conduct. Now, though the people were very punctual in the duties of their public ceremonial ſervice, which, though civil inſtitutions, were alſo religious, and conſtituted their public worſhip, as being the figures of ſpiritual things, and, God being the author of them, they were directly addreſſed to God;——yet, alas, like too many in the Chriſtian church, though punctual in externals, when it ſuited their taſte,——their moral conduct, their lives and converſation, were, in other reſpects, in general, a ſcandal to their profeſſion. It is directly in this view,

the Prophet, in his firſt chapter, exhorts the Jewiſh people. In the ſame view all the prophets often exhorted them. And in this ſtrain it is, that the ſpirit and meaning of all the prophets is, to inculcate purity of heart, good morals, and univerſal holineſs.

As to the other quotation from Iſaiah, with which the doctrine of the frame of mind ſtamping value, &c. is confirmed, it is indeed moſt amazing. It is a ſolemn and dreadful charge againſt the Jews for their idolatry, and an alarming call to repentance upon that account. And whilſt the prophet charges them with idolatry, he mentions their pouring out a drink offering, and offering a meat offering to their idols, verſe 6th, with this keen reproach,——"Should I (viz. the Lord) receive comfort in theſe?" Strange! if it ſhould be thought the frame of mind ſhould ſtamp value on any ſuch offerings as theſe; or that there could be any poſſible agreement (if it is the context the candidate had in view) between that frame, mentioned in the 15th verſe of this chapter, and theſe offerings. True, indeed, it was pled, tenaciouſly in his favour, that this was a ſlip of his pen, and that it was the following chapter, viz. the lviii. of Iſa. 5th verſe, that he meant:——But even that is as little to the purpoſe; for there the Prophet treats of faſting, not of ſacrifices and feaſting; and it is remarkable, that through the whole of the prophecies of Iſaiah, from beginning to end, there is not any chapter but the lviii. where there is any thing, in the 5th verſe, mentioned directly relative to any offerings whatever.

But this is not the laſt of theſe inſtances we have to obſerve. Amos v. 2. is cited, for that prophet's ſaying "God hated and deſpiſed their feaſt days, and ſolemn aſſemblies," &c. Whereas, there, it is "The virgin of Iſrael is fallen, &c. And though, perhaps, a better excuſe can be made for this miſtake than any of the former, yet their proof united is irreſiſtible; and, take them in the moſt favourable light, they clearly diſcover both

ignorance of the ſubject, and ignorance of holy ſcripture. The firſt four not only fall ſhort, as proofs of that for which they are adduced, but ſtand clearly in evidence againſt it. Five of the laſt, though to be met with ſome where in the Bible, evidently ſhow, that the Bible was none of thoſe books made uſe of by the candidate when *writing* this diſcourſe, or even ſo much as looked into, to ſee whether things were ſo, after it was *written*. And one of them, of ſuch a kind, as take it according to appearance, it is better to caſt a vail over it than deſcribe it in words adequate to its import.

Another particular objection of the Preſbytery againſt the diſcourſe claims now a little attention, viz. "That in his deſcription of the manifeſtations of God to man, when he comes to ſpeak *afterwards* of the manifeſtation in or by Jeſus Chriſt, he does it only in ſuch general terms, as leaves great room to doubt what his own ſentiments, in reſpect to the peculiar doctrines of the Chriſtian diſpenſation, are." It appears, indeed, they had good reaſon thus to object. The purpoſe of the ſecond head of the diſcourſe is to ſhew, that "it is the tendency of all theſe manifeſtations which God has made, in favour of the degenerate children of men, to recommend mercy and holineſs*." And how is it attempted to do this? Why, truly,—by giving us an account of the tendency of the Moſaic conſtitution,—not of theſe manifeſtations, in favour of the degenerate children of men, that are contained in that "firſt written revelation given to men by the means of Moſes." Upon this conſtitution the chief part of this whole diſcourſe turns: and when the diſpenſation, or manifeſtation, in and by Chriſt, comes to be ſpoken of, it is done only as it were by the bye, or to prevent an objection.

The Moſaic conſtitution, though intimately connected with the goſpel diſpenſation, was, in itſelf, properly conſidered, not a manifeſtation in favour of the degene-

* See p. 9. of the foregoing ſermon.

rate children of men, but a political eſtabliſhment in favour of a ſmall handful of people. But the firſt written revelation God gave to men, by means of Moſes, contains, indeed, amazing manifeſtations of love and grace to all the degenerate children of men, none of which has been ſo much as looked into, or even thought of, by the candidate. Had he conſulted the Moſaic revelation,——the firſt manifeſtation we ſhould have been preſented with (indeed two thouſand years older than the law of Moſes) was that of God to man immediately after the fall, in the promiſe of mercy, or covenant of grace, through the ſeed of the woman. The republication of this, to Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, would have claimed for its place ſome eminent period of the diſcourſe. The ſpirit of the law, and the teſtimony of the prophets, would have been held forth as having this for their ſignificancy and ſubſtance. In this view, the revelation, by means of Moſes, is made to *all* the degenerate children of men, and calculated to reſtore them from that degeneracy, and in no other. Had he treated his ſubject, as, by its very ſtate, choſen and laid down by himſelf, he ought to have done, this muſt have been his courſe. He had no other to take. And in this way he had infinite advantages in ſhewing the tendency of God's manifeſtation of himſelf to degenerate men, to promote mercy and holineſs amongſt them, in compariſon with all theſe he has ſqueezed out of his wreſted notions of the law.

But to go on to the views he gives, particularly of the goſpel, in the few words he has about it; when he comes to ſpeak of its tendency, &c. "The ſpirit of the "goſpel muſt be the ſpirit of holineſs and mercy*. "We were the ſervants of ſin, and heirs of deſtruc- "tion. God was pleaſed to ſend his Son to die for us, "*and relieve us* from this miſerable ſituation. We are "called by every invitation to holineſs and integrity,

* See p. 12. of the foregoing ſermon.

" It was the love of God which moved him to ſend our " Redeemer into the world." Let it be here attended to, that both his text, and the place he ſtood in, as a candidate for the miniſtry of the goſpel, laid him under inviolable obligations, to treat of pure and undefiled religion, &c. in ſuch a manner, as to give us the great out-lines of the religion of Chriſt. Without this, he could not enter into the ſcope of the Apoſtle, and intention of the text. Without this, he could not give the deſcription of the religion of a ſinner; without treating his ſubject in this way, the preſbytery could have no evidence, from the diſcourſe, that he was fit to preach the pure religion of the goſpel. What ſort of deſcription of religion we have in the diſcourſe, hath been already ſeen. Here, he ſteps out of his general road, in order to ſpeak a little of the goſpel; not, indeed, to deſcribe and illuſtrate the religion which it conſtitutes, but to ſpeak of it, as a motive to mercy and holineſs. One would naturally expect, that (indulging him in this manner of treating the ſubject) he would ſet the goſpel, or Chriſtian religion, and Chriſt its maſter, in ſuch points of view, as to give the grand motives to mercy and holineſs, deduced from thence, energy and ſtrength, and point out ſome of the chiefeſt of its motives in a particular manner; and, at leaſt, mention, if no more, one principle and motive of goſpel holineſs, without which the religion of Chriſt acknowledges no holineſs at all, viz. the Holy Ghoſt, the ſanctifier. We think it is the firſt diſcourſe we ever heard from a Chriſtian preacher, inculcating holineſs and mercy, without the Holy Spirit in it, name or thing. As to theſe few general words, in which he ſpeaks of the goſpel, and the love of God in Chriſt to die for us, "*and relieve us*,"—ſuch words have been, and are every day uſed, and even vaſtly ſtronger * expreſſions than

* As for the ſake of the Engliſh reader, and to ſave trouble in turning to originals, may be ſeen, at large, in Biſhop Stillingfleet on the True Reaſons of the Sufferings of Chriſt, Fol. 2d Edit. p. 266.

they are, by thoſe who deny the proper atonement and ſatisfaction of Chriſt, and taken in connection with his doctrine about expiatory ſacrifices, their meaning is obvious.

As to the laſt objection, ſtated by the preſbytery againſt the diſcourſe,—viz. "That Mr Addie, in purſuing the above plan in more than one place, and particularly towards the concluſion, ſeems to reſt our final acceptance with God upon that charitable frame of ſpirit, and life of holineſs, which he had been recommending, and thereby, to the apprehenſion of the objectors, publiſhing the merit of good works *."—The premiſſes ſtand clear in ſupport of this concluſion, and can in no fair conſtruction whatever bear any other.

In a view of religion, where neither the Son of God, nor the Holy Spirit, are conſidered as in its great object; where neither the Mediator, an atonement, nor *influence* of the Holy Spirit, are conſidered as in its effect,—and where notwithſtanding, hope of eternal reward, likeneſs to God, holineſs, acceptance with God, and eternal glory, are repreſented, either as its conſtituent nature, direct influence, or eternal recompence,—what other bottom is there to found upon but works? None certainly. For, what is ſpoken about the mercy of God, in general, and his forgiving us our hundred talents, becauſe we could not pay,—as upon the one hand, they are high ſounding words without a meaning, where the Son of God is not conſidered as in the object of religion, and his mediation as the only way in which ſinful men are made, *by real ſaving influence*, partakers of mercy; ſo, upon the other, they are the common fund—of credit, upon which all thoſe ſet out, who eſtabliſh the merit of works, either in conjunction with, or in oppoſition to the merits of Chriſt. In a word, without the Mediator, and the Spirit of God, to talk of mercy and forgiveneſs, of divine likeneſs and holineſs, is begging

* See p. 13. of the foregoing ſermon.

the queſtion, and reſting our final acceptance with God, and eternal ſalvation, entirely upon ourſelves.

As to the inſtances alluded to in proof of this objection, they are in many places to be met with in the diſcourſe, and muſt be ſo, ſeeing other foundation is wanting. They are the very ſpirit of it; and the chain of ſcriptures, at the concluſion, put together, ſo as to give us the ſenſe of the candidate, can in connection with the whole, fairly bear no other ſenſe.

A few reflections ſhall finiſh what is further needful to be ſaid.

And—may it not, indeed, appear ſurpriſing to the world, that, upon theſe grounds, the preſbytery might not be ſuffered to reject this piece of trial, and fiſt procedure, till they ſhould judge what was proper to be done in a caſe that appeared to them of ſuch importance? The impartial world will, now, that the ſermon and the preſbytery's objections are fairly communicated to the public, be fully able to judge. And it is with pleaſure, as well as with a good conſcience, the preſbytery can look upon the enſuing meeting of the ſupreme judicatory of this church, where it is to be expected, piety and learning, candour and honour, will give the final deciſion. Suppoſing the preſbytery miſtaken in their judgment, and wrong in their deciſion, were they, therefore, to be accuſed of unfair dealing, and acting upon preconcerted deſign? I mention this accuſation with deteſtation; I look upon the charge with abhorrence. I think no perſon capable of it, but he who can impute the crime to his neighbour without a cauſe,—without any cauſe but grovelling ſuſpicion, as low as the ſouls in which it is found to lodge. The cauſe of the preſbytery, upon the footing on which it is ſtated by the appellants, is the cauſe of every honeſt man, of every member of a church court particularly, who thinks for himſelf, and is ſo honeſt, when ſitting in judgment, as to ſpeak what he thinks, though the ſpirit, and num-

bers of party, and manner of the times ſhould be againſt him.

I will not ſpeak what might be thought evil of dignities: but how this charge againſt us of the preſbytery, who were objectors to the diſcourſe, was received at the ſynod, hundreds were witneſſes.

It is always juſtly looked upon, by *ſober* judges, as an undoubted ſign of a bad cauſe, when railing accuſations are uſed by a party inſtead of argument. How that cauſe was debated at the bar of the ſynod, at Irvine, againſt the preſbytery, all who were preſent know.

A man was brought from Glaſgow, who appeared as procurator for the patron, and for Mr Addie. Did he enter into the merits of the cauſe? Did he debate on the various points objected againſt the diſcourſe? No, not ſo much as a word. He was brought from Glaſgow, to read a ſcurrilous libel, a dirty invective againſt the characters of four miniſters of the preſbytery, and ſome other abſent perſons, who had no concern in the cauſe. *It was read! It was heard!* And when heard, it evidently bore internal characters of the origin from whence it ſprang. Had the honourable patron ever ſeen it, he would have diſclaimed it, and ſpurned it from him with indignation; nor, to do Mr Addie juſtice, can it be at all imputed to him. It was the ſole production of ſome who pretend to be his friends, but are in reality his worſt enemies.

What occurs to me, in regard to what hath been, or may be, argued, by judges, againſt the preſbytery's objections, I ſhall endeavour to obviate in as few words as I can.

It hath been ſaid, that it is abſurd to bring in a whole ſyſtem of divinity into a ſingle diſcourſe.——That is moſt certainly true; and it never entered into the heads of any of the preſbytery, that it ought to be done. All that they deſiderated upon this ſubject, was, that the

different branches of it, as ſtated by the candidate himſelf, ſhould have been illuſtrated according to truth, and according to the doctrine, ſpirit, and deſign, of the religion of Jeſus Chriſt, and the whole according to ſcripture proof: the reverſe of which, it is thought, hath been clearly ſhown through almoſt all its different parts.

It hath been ſtrongly aſſerted, that the objections, with regard to the omiſſions, particularly, are ill founded, becauſe theſe doctrines omitted make no proper part of his ſubject.

It cannot but be thought ſurpriſing, that the chief weight of all the arguments, in defence of the diſcourſe, ſhould be laid here.

Had the ſubject of diſcourſe been a moral virtue, or a moral duty, conſidered in an abſtract light, it might have been looked upon as compleat in all its parts, without any thing of what is, in this caſe, charged as an eſſential defect, directly expreſſed, or included. But even if this had been delivered in a Chriſtian pulpit, whether upon trials, or on an ordinary occaſion, we beg leave to ſay, it muſt have been both defective and unfair: For theſe virtues and duties being of moſt high importance, the buſineſs of preaching, in its eſſential nature, and the claims of Chriſtians, who are hearers, both unite in this indiſpenſible obligation, upon the preacher, to exhibit them upon the principles of the goſpel, and inculcate them, at leaſt, by thoſe motives, particularly expreſſed, without which Chriſtianity does not conſider them as acceptable in the eye of an omniſcient God.———But the diſcourſe, under review, has, for its ſubject, a matter of vaſtly higher and more comprehenſive importance,——Religion itſelf,—the religion of "the word,—the perfect law of liberty,"—the religion of ſinners,—religion before God as the Father of Chriſt, and the Father of his people in Chriſt. And can it be ſaid, that this religion is at all

deſcribed, when no other view of its *great object* is given, but what will equally ſuit the heathen as well as the Chriſtian name? When no other view of the influence of its object, in forming men to a divine likeneſs, is given, but what is repreſented as the operation of merely natural powers? When no notion of the Mediator, and Holy Spirit of God, is repreſented as having *active, habitual influence*, in the effect? And where, yet, the hope of reward, and eternal glory itſelf, are ſaid to be the conſequences? We leave it to the ſupreme judicatory of this church, and to the impartial world, to ſay if it can.

It hath been ſaid, theſe are but omiſſions. It hath been replied, that by omitting to give a man his neceſſary food, you will as effectually put him to death as if you had poiſoned him.——And by omitting to feed ſouls with the bread of eternal life, in want of that bread they muſt eternally periſh. And the purpoſe of the candidate's trials was to take proof of his abilities for being a paſtor to the ſouls of men.

But, we muſt add, more properly conſidered, they are not omiſſions. Some things, upon theſe heads, have been ſhown to ſtand in direct oppoſition to truth, particularly, upon the influence of the object of religion, as repreſented in the diſcourſe; and on the notion of pardoning mercy, or infinite goodneſs, as diſcoverable by reaſon, without the aid of revelation. Other things alſo, inſerted in direct oppoſition to truth, have claimed our attention in this review. But, even without theſe plain aſſertions, the view of religion given through the whole of the diſcourſe is mutilated, and the different parts of it, though the method was intirely at his own choice, are groſsly maimed. In one word, either the Son of God and the Holy Spirit are eſſential to the object of religion, or they are not: if they are not eſſential to the object of religion, then the diſcourſe, upon that head, is blameleſs; but if they are

eſſential, and for *this* an appeal is made to the whole of the New Teſtament, then, it is groſsly culpable, and cannot, in the light of truth and juſtice, be ſuſtained. The ſame chain of reaſoning, with the ſame proof, directly correſponds to every article, under the head of the preſbytery's objections.——This clearly accounts for the aſtoniſhing manner in which that ſtrong hold of thoſe in oppoſition to the preſbytery was maintained. Inſtead of reaſon and argument, we were much entertained with what was called pinning of ſermons, and hauling into diſcourſes ſubjects that did not belong to them.——To ſet out upon a *petitio principii*, a begging the queſtion, is always a ready ſtock in hand to appeal with to the riſible, when the ſubject cannot ſtand the teſt of the rational powers.——Launching out upon this bottom,—how horribly did the great leader in the cauſe ſhock humanity itſelf, and every tender benevolent feeling of the human heart! The aſhes of two dead miniſters were raked into, and prophaned: Their names were mentioned with deriſion, and their memories held up to ſcorn.———The one preached, and the other pinned. The articles of Dort were the pinnings. They preached, and they pinned.———But, now,——the men, and the articles of Dort are no more!———Alas! for the champion. One of theſe miniſters was, not long ago, neighbour to the writer of this paper. He knew him well. The other he has heard of. But whatever the character of either was, it will be ſome attainment for this mighty ſcorner, if ever he be as uſeful, in the miniſtry of the goſpel, as any one of them was in his day.

What, as yet, the preſbytery hath heard againſt their objections on the article of expiatory ſacrifices, except wherein they were greatly miſrepreſented, is, to them, utterly unintelligible, being wrapped up in ſuch impenetrable darkneſs, that neither the writer of this, nor any of them, can tell what it is.

But what hath been ſaid in defence of the quotations of ſcripture that have paſſed under review? Why, truly,—they were ſlips of the pen. *Credat judæus apella.* But who, in his ſenſes, can believe it? One or two might have happened;——but ten ſlips of a pen,—and more too (if the preſbytery had been in the carping humour) might have been condeſcended upon. Five citations ſtand, directly, as evidence, that the doctrine founded upon them, is not only not in them, but that it is abſolutely falſe. Other five are not to be found where cited. Suppoſing a candidate for the profeſſion of the law on trials, and in ſimilar circumſtances, with reſpect to the ſtatutes of his country, for proving his theſis,—what would the profeſſors of an univerſity do? Would they, or could they, in ſuch a caſe, confer upon him the degree of doctor of laws? No. The ſtatutes of their ſociety, and the laws of honour and conſcience expreſsly forbid it. In ſuch a caſe, what would the honourable faculty of advocates, in our own country, do with a young candidate for the bar?——Their well known learning and honour command us not to indulge the thought, that they could, poſſibly, admit him of their number. And ſhall the laws of the church, the rules of honour, and the ties of conſcience, be broke through, in order to clear the way to the pulpit——Tell it not in Gath.

What other arguments have been uſed in the world againſt the preſbytery's objections, cannot be, certainly, told. But this is truth;——puerility itſelf, in public, and in private, hath put on the face of argument againſt them. They have had "dull ſtuff, heavy D——h ſtuff," with elocution ſuitable to the ſentiment, thrown in their faces. They have been loaded with the charge of the *higheſt impiety in doctrine.*—But, having often obſerved the power of *a ſpirit imbibed ab extra*, they conſider both the inſult and calumny as utterly contemptible, whilſt they ſincerely pi

y, and heartily forgive, the poor people.———But, fter all,—it will, perhaps, be aſked, what hereſy is he candidate accuſed of by the preſbytery?——In this efined age, in which we live, the name of hereſy-unter is odious, and perhaps, in many caſes, juſtly. But even, if it were not ſo, how could it be expected o diſcover the features of what can be called any articular hereſy, in all its parts, in ſuch a diſcourſe as his? Hereſies have generally for their object ſome one r more of the peculiar doctrines of Chriſtianity which ey avowedly impugn, or tenaciouſly pervert: but, this deſcription of religion, theſe doctrines lye bu-ed in total oblivion; in this light it may be conſidered, s, in ſome ſort, containing all hereſies in one.

Viewing the preſbytery as a corporation, taking any ſſay piece from an intrant to their ſociety, they have eclared this piece of trial totally inſufficient. The rounds of this procedure are now ſent abroad in the orld. They aſk, they expect, impartial judgment. hey are far from looking upon themſelves as infal-ble. If they are wrong, they will rejoice in being t right. They are conſcious of having acted from rinciples of integrity and truth. And whatever be e iſſue of this cauſe, they are inwardly ſatisfied with e reflections of having done their duty; and they oubt not, but the more the cauſe is attended to, they all be the more fully juſtified in the eye of their ſu-eriors, as they hope to be in the eyes of God and all ood men.

THE END.

## ERRATA.

Page 33, line 6, from the top, *for* paſs *read* pay.

Page 39, line 22, *for* ſin entered into the world the patriarchal age after the flood, *read* ſin entered into the world, in the patriarchal age, after the flood.

Page 51, line 24, *for* chiefeſt *read* chief.